indestructible, survives the phenomenal and outlives the
temporal, that is the Divine Essence in us. Therefore we
are not different in essence; yet we are different in logical
necessity from the Supreme Soul, the Soul of our soul. We
should not be able at all to think of and think to God, if
God and we did not stand apart in conception and also
per-contra, if there were no oneness between God and us.
Thus conceptually, there is difference, but essentially there
is none between *Jeeva* and *Siva.* If we grasp this principle
there is little ground for the fear that no synthesis is possible
between monism and dualism.
Herein lies the key to the oft-repeated affirmation of
the identity of man to God, to utterances like *So ^hamasmi,*
I am he, *AhamBrahmasmi,* I am Brahman, *Ayamatma* Brahma,
this self is Brahman, *Tat tvam asi,* Thou art that. *Tattm-*
'masi means according to Ramanuja "You cannot exist with-
out God—God is your Self, that is that on which you depend
for your existence and your activity ". The identity implied
in this famous text lies, according to him, not between the
Universal and the individual self but between the Self of
the Universe and the Self of the individual

self. He says
that the word ' *that'* points to the Brahman
who is Omni-
scient, who wills the truth and who is the
cause of the world
and that the word ' *thou* ' which is equated
with ' *that'* sets
forth the Brahman whose body is the
individual self. Even
the most unqualified Monism contains an
element of difference,
however obstinately it may try to ignore it.
It delights
in the equation *So ham* " :— He is I or '
I am He \ But
this equation would be as-impossible
without difference as
without unity. The He ' and I ' are
Brahman in two
moods of forms, the Universal and the
individual. If the
difference of the moods of forms is
ignored, the equation,
that is to say. Monism as a doctrine of
spiritual condition
becomes impossible. The state of supreme
illumination in
which the unity of God and man is
perceived, belongs ,to